

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AS ADOPTED MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to suspend the rules relating to the following measures be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Monday, May 19, 2008:

House Concurrent Resolution 300, Senate Joint Resolution 17, House Concurrent Resolution 325, House Resolution 1074, H.R. 3323, House Concurrent Resolution 334, House Resolution 1152, House Resolution 1132, House Resolution 1153, House Resolution 1026, H.R. 752, and H.R. 5787.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, applicable titles are amended.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, sundry motions to reconsider are laid on the table.

There was no objection.

FOOD, CONSERVATION, AND ENERGY ACT OF 2008—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 110-115)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2419, the "Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008."

For a year and a half, I have consistently asked that the Congress pass a good farm bill that I can sign. Regrettably, the Congress has failed to do so. At a time of high food prices and record farm income, this bill lacks program reform and fiscal discipline. It continues subsidies for the wealthy and increases farm bill spending by more than \$20 billion, while using budget gimmicks to hide much of the increase. It is inconsistent with our objectives in international trade negotiations, which include securing greater market access for American farmers and ranchers. It would needlessly expand the size and scope of government. Americans sent us to Washington to achieve results and be good stewards of their hard-earned taxpayer dollars. This bill violates that fundamental commitment.

In January 2007, my Administration put forward a fiscally responsible farm bill proposal that would improve the safety net for farmers and move current programs toward more market-oriented policies. The bill before me today fails to achieve these important goals.

At a time when net farm income is projected to increase by more than \$28 billion in 1 year, the American tax-

payer should not be forced to subsidize that group of farmers who have adjusted gross incomes of up to \$1.5 million. When commodity prices are at record highs, it is irresponsible to increase government subsidy rates for 15 crops, subsidize additional crops, and provide payments that further distort markets. Instead of better targeting farm programs, this bill eliminates the existing payment limit on marketing loan subsidies.

Now is also not the time to create a new uncapped revenue guarantee that could cost billions of dollars more than advertised. This is on top of a farm bill that is anticipated to cost more than \$600 billion over 10 years. In addition, this bill would force many businesses to prepay their taxes in order to finance the additional spending.

This legislation is also filled with earmarks and other ill-considered provisions. Most notably, H.R. 2419 provides: \$175 million to address water issues for desert lakes; \$250 million for a 400,000-acre land purchase from a private owner; funding and authority for the noncompetitive sale of National Forest land to a ski resort; and \$382 million earmarked for a specific watershed. These earmarks, and the expansion of Davis-Bacon Act prevailing wage requirements, have no place in the farm bill. Rural and urban Americans alike are frustrated with excessive government spending and the funneling of taxpayer funds for pet projects. This bill will only add to that frustration.

The bill also contains a wide range of other objectionable provisions, including one that restricts our ability to redirect food aid dollars for emergency use at a time of great need globally. The bill does not include the requested authority to buy food in the developing world to save lives. Additionally, provisions in the bill raise serious constitutional concerns. For all the reasons outlined above, I must veto H.R. 2419, and I urge the Congress to extend current law for a year or more.

I veto this bill fully aware that it is rare for a stand-alone farm bill not to receive the President's signature, but my action today is not without precedent. In 1956, President Eisenhower stood firmly on principle, citing high crop subsidies and too much government control of farm programs among the reasons for his veto. President Eisenhower wrote in his veto message, "Bad as some provisions of this bill are, I would have signed it if in total it could be interpreted as sound and good for farmers and the nation." For similar reasons, I am vetoing the bill before me today.

GEORGE W. BUSH.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 21, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

The question is, Will the House, on reconsideration, pass the bill, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 1 hour.

□ 1630

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and further would yield 10 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and ask unanimous consent that he may control that time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I ask my colleagues to listen up here because this has been a very difficult bill and there has been numerous problems that have developed every day for the last year-and-a-half. I guess it's appropriate that there would be a problem that would be developing today as well.

When the enrolling clerk enrolled the bill to send to the White House, somehow or another they inadvertently, or however it happened, did not include the trade title, title III of the bill, in the official documents that went to the White House. So the President vetoed the bill minus the trade title, title III.

The trade title includes the food aid programs, including McGovern-Dole; it includes the market promotion; the export credit program; the market access program, and it also includes the soft wood lumber certification program.

So we are moving ahead to override the veto that the President has done. But we have this issue that one of the titles is missing from the bill. We have a process after we get through the override to try to deal with that issue.

Mr. Speaker, the President's veto message said that when the commodity prices are high, it's irresponsible to increase government subsidy rates for 15 crops and subsidize additional crops and so forth. We made some adjustments in some of the price supports to try to rebalance the system from what it has been in the past. These were modest, and I think it's questionable that you would use this as one of the items in the veto override.

As I have worked through this process, I spent more time than anybody else talking to the White House, trying to avoid the situation we are in today, where the President has vetoed this bill. I don't know that anybody else has spent more time trying to work with the White House. The problem has been that they keep changing the objections to the bill, and 2 or 3 weeks ago, when we tried to engage the White House to be able to work with them in a negotiating fashion to take into consideration some of their concerns, their position was that, well, they had these demands but they really weren't in a position or willing to negotiate with us.

So we have come to this day where the White House has vetoed this bill,